

Remarks

This amendment is in response to the Office Letter mailed August 28, 2002. Claims 1-25 are entered for examination. The Examiner rejects claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miloslavsky (US 5,946,387), hereinafter Miloslavsky.

In response to the Examiner's rejection, applicant herein provides arguments to more particularly point out the subject matter regarded as patentable by the applicant, distinguishing unarguably over the art of Miloslavsky.

Regarding claims 1, 8, 15, 20, 22 and 23, the Examiner states Miloslavsky discloses a method and system for establishing a remote agent station from a call center (elements 121 and 122), comprising steps of: a) establishing a data link between a computer platform at the remote agent station and a CTI processor connected to a telephony switch (123 and 124) at the call center (Fig. 1 and col. 4-5 lines 65-66).

Applicant must disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Miloslavsky, and the manner in which the Examiner relates the teachings of Miloslavsky to applicant's claim language. The practice of quoting the applicant's claim language and attributing it to the reference is always misleading. The reference should be quoted for what it actually says, and then argued how that teaching reads on the applicant's claim. The Examiner is citing portions of the reference, then quoting parts of applicant's claims which are plainly and clearly not the language of the reference.

The Examiner seems to be relating elements 121 and 122 of Miloslavsky to the remote agent station of applicant's invention, and elements 123 and 124 to the telephony switches at the call center.

Applicant points out that elements 121 and 122 of Miloslavsky are call centers, not remote agent stations as claimed. Elements 123 and 124 are telephony switches located at the call centers 121 and 122 respectively. Miloslavsky specifically teaches that Fig 1 shows two call centers 121 and 122.

Each of the call centers 121 and 122 includes a central switch (123 for center 121 and 124 for center 122) providing routing to individual telephone stations (col. 4, lines 55-64).

Applicant argues that call centers 121 and 122 of Miloslavsky cannot read on the remote agent stations of applicant's invention. Secondly, applicant argues that switches 123 and 124 of Miloslavsky are local to call centers 121 and 122. The portion of Miloslavsky, relied upon by the Examiner, cannot possibly read on establishing a connection between a call center and a remote, (separate location) agent station as claimed.

Applicant argues that Miloslavsky teaches a system including a structure enabling the routing of calls from a telephony network to call centers, and in turn to agent stations at the call centers for the purpose of routing calls at the agent level from the network. Applicant's invention teaches a structure wherein remote agent stations are established in a separate physical location than the call center itself. Calls are routed to the remote agent station from the call center via a telephony (PSTN) connection, and information relating to the calls are routed to the remote agent station via a separate data connection to a CTI server at the call center. The two structures are not the same and cannot read on each other.


The PTO has upheld basic requirements of anticipation in that it is not enough to require that the disclosure in a single prior art reference disclose all of the claimed elements, rather, as stated by the Federal Circuit, anticipation requires the presence in a single disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the recited claim. Miloslavsky fails to disclose the elements and connections in the order specifically claimed in applicant's invention. The agents are not remote from the call center in the Miloslavsky reference.

Applicant believes claims 1, 8, 15, 20, 22 and 23 are patentable over the art of Miloslavsky as argued above. Applicant respectfully requests consideration, and that the case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any extensions of time required, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due, authorization is given to deduct the fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Version With Markings to Show Changes Made

There are no changes herein made to the claims or the specification in the present Amendment.

Respectfully Submitted,
Dan Kikinis et al.

by 
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys
Central Coast Patent Agency
P.O. Box 187
Aromas, CA 95004
(831) 726-1457